

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

ENITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Enited States Patent: and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Bot. 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 vvvw.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/005,569	12/05/2001	Leo Diehm	5351-05	8006
75	7590 06:24:2004		EXAMINER	
Emhart Glass	Manufacturing Inc.		VINCENT	SEAN E
89 Phoenix Ave P.O. Box 1229	enue		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Enfield, CT 00	6082		1731	
			DATE MADE ED DE DATEDO	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			\mathcal{C}
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/005,569	DIEHM ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Sean E Vincent	1731	
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet wi	th the correspondence addre	SS
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RITHE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CF after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, find the period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory properties of the period for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by some analysis and the period for reply will, by some period for reply will.	ON. R 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a rent. a reply within the statutory minimum of thirt. griod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON attact.	eply be timely filed y (30) days will be considered timely. THS from the mailing date of this comm ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	unication.
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _			
	This action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for all closed in accordance with the practice und	owance except for formal matt	•	erits is
Disposition of Claims			
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-5 is/are pending in the applicate 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-5 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction a	ndrawn from consideration.		,
Application Papers			
9)⊠ The specification is objected to by the Exam	miner.		
10) \boxtimes The drawing(s) filed on <u>08 March 2002</u> is/a	re: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ obj	ected to by the Examiner.	
Applicant may not request that any objection to	***	` '	
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the constant of the con			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for for a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docum 2. Certified copies of the priority docum 3. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International But * See the attached detailed Office action for a	nents have been received. nents have been received in A priority documents have been ureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	pplication No received in this National Sta	age
Attachment(s)			
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		ummary (PTO-413)	
 Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-9483) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/St Paper No(s)/Mail Date)/Mail Date rformal Patent Application (PTO-15 	2)

Art Unit: 1731

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: A "pressure setting means" as recited in claim 4 was not disclosed in the specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
 - The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.
- 3. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The specification does not contain support for "said pressure setting means".
- 4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
 The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 5. Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Application/Control Number: 10/005,569 Page 3

Art Unit: 1731

6. Claim 1 recites the limitation "the retracted position" in the last line. There is insufficient

antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

7. Claim 1 is further indefinite because it recites twice "a predetermined time" (lines 16-17

and line 26) and it does not appear to refer to the same predetermined time.

8. Claim 4 recites the limitation "said pressure setting means" in line 2. There is insufficient

antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

9. Claim 5 recites the limitation "the molds" in the last line. There is insufficient antecedent

basis for this limitation in the claim (only one mold had antecedent basis).

10. Claim 5 would read more clearly if in line 14 "where" was changed to "at which".

11. Claims 2 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete

for omitting essential elements, such omission amounting to a gap between the elements. See

MPEP § 2172.01. The omitted elements are: a control means or pressure setting means to accept

an input means.

12. Claims 3 and 4 are further indefinite because "said predetermined time" could be

referring to either or both of the predetermined times stated in claim 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

13. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on

sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Application/Control Number: 10/005,569

Art Unit: 1731

14. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Rodriquez-Wong et al (US 5807419). Col. 4, lines 3-9 taught a blow head fixed by a holding lock. Col. 3, lines 32-48 taught a blow tube. Col. 5, lines 32-67 teach the operation of the displacement means (pneumatic cylinders) to raise and lower the blow head. Rodriquez-Wong did not teach holding the blow head at a selected vertical distance or an exhaust position for a predetermined time. Note that the manner or method in which a machine is to be utilized is not germane to the issue of patentability of the machine itself, see *In re Casey*, 152 U.S.P.Q. 235 (CCPA 1967).

Allowable Subject Matter

- 15. Claims 2-4 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
- 16. Claim 5 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, set forth in this Office action.
- 17. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

 The prior art does not teach or fairly suggest a blow head assembly as claimed including a control with input means for inputting a selected vertical distance or a predetermined time as claimed. The prior art does not teach or fairly suggest a blow head assembly as claimed including a means for determining when the parison has been blown as claimed. The prior art does not teach or fairly suggest a method of blowing a parison as claimed including detecting the

Application/Control Number: 10/005,569

Art Unit: 1731

point where the parison is blown as claimed. It would not have been obvious to add these modifications to the arrangement of Rodriquez-Wong et al.

Conclusion

- 18. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is cited to further show the state of the art.
- 19. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sean E Vincent whose telephone number is (571) 272-1194. The examiner can normally be reached on M F (8:30 6:00).
- 20. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Steven P Griffin can be reached on (571) 272-1189. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.
- 21. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Sean E Vincent Primary Examiner Art Unit 1731

S Vincent